

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated July 26, 2007, in which the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over European Patent Application Publication EP 1 085 484 A2 to Nozaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,470,233 to Fruchterman et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection below. Claims 5 and 6 are currently pending. The current Amendment adds new claim 11, leaving claims 5, 6 and 11 pending upon entrance of the current Amendment. Claim 5 is the only independent claim.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nozaki in view of Fruchterman. A claim rejection under § 103 is improper unless the prior art references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every claim recitation.

Applicants' claim 5 recites a method of supporting a self-sustained moving comprising the steps of inputting physical disability information and a destination from a communication terminal, computing a guide route of a sidewalk according to the physical disability information based on the physical disability information inputted from the communication terminal and sidewalk data stored in a database, the sidewalk data correlating to the physical disability information, combining the computed guide route with a map data stored in the database to output it as an electronic map, and displaying the electronic map showing the guide route on the communication terminal, wherein the step of computing the guide route includes preferentially computing the sidewalk that has been passed by a plurality of users having similar physical disability information.

Nozaki does not show or disclose each and every recitation of Applicants' amended claim 5. For example, Nozaki does not teach or suggest a method of supporting a self-sustained moving wherein the step of computing the guide route includes preferentially computing the sidewalk that has been passed by a

plurality of users having similar physical disability information. Instead, Nozaki's route setting appears to be based exclusively on information about the route, itself, such that there is no preference for a route previously used by users with similar characteristics. In fact, Nozaki expressly discloses:

Moreover, in the case in which the user is to specify the *same* two points again to set a route, he (she) can get an opportunity for a new discovery related to area information if a route *different* from the set route is set. (Nozaki, paragraph [0091]; emphasis added.)

The foregoing reveals that, if anything, Nozaki *teaches away* from preferentially setting a route previously used by users with similar characteristics.

Fruchterman does not add to the teachings of Nozaki, at least in that Fruchterman also does not teach or suggest a method of supporting a self-sustained moving wherein the step of computing the guide route includes preferentially computing the sidewalk that has been passed by a plurality of users having similar physical disability information. Instead, Fruchterman teaches that a user can "let the Sextant software determine the *shortest* route between the points." (Fruchterman, col. 4, lines 48-54; emphasis added.)

Additionally, Fruchterman's disclosure regarding allowing a single blind user to store *his or her own* route preferences (see, e.g., Fruchtermnan, col. 4, lines 16-54) does not teach or suggest preferentially computing a guide route based on which sidewalks *other* blind users have passed, unlike the method recited by Applicants' claim 5. In fact, Fruchterman does not even appear to teach or suggest that its system would even store, or have access to, information on routes taken by any *other* users.

Thus, neither Nozaki nor Fruchterman, nor the combination thereof, teaches or suggests each and every recitation of Applicants' claim 5. Additionally, Nozaki teaches away from modification in such a manner so as to teach or suggest the recitations of Applicants' claim 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nozaki in view of Fruchterman is improper for at least this reason, and should be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/519,859

Final Office Action dated: July 26, 2007

Response to Final Office Action dated: September 24, 2007

Claim 6 was also rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nozaki in view of Fruchterman. Claim 6 depends directly from claim 5 and includes additional recitations thereto. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nozaki in view of Fruchterman is improper for at least this reason, and should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in the current Amendment constitutes new matter. New claim 11 is supported by at least paragraph [0033] of the current Specification. Additionally, new claim 11 depends from the previously-presented claim 5, which is allowable over the cited prior art references for at least the reasons set forth above. Furthermore, new claim 11 recites that the physical disability information includes use of a wheelchair, which recitation is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record, either alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that new claim 11 be entered, and claims 5, 6 and 11 be passed to issue.

Applicants believe no fees are due in connection with this Amendment and Response. If any fees are deemed necessary, authorization is hereby granted to charge any such fees to Deposit Account No. 13-0235.

Respectfully submitted,

By ____/Marina F. Cunningham/
Marina F. Cunningham
Registration No. 38,419
Attorney for the Applicant

McCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402
(860) 549-5290
Customer No.: 35301